

Docket No: 247409US26

Applicant Initiated Interview Request FormApplication No.: 10/751,898 First Named Applicant: Shosuke ENDOH, et al.Examiner: MACARTHUR, S. Art Unit: 1792 Status of Application: Pending (After Final)**Tentative Participants:**(1) Lee L. Stepina (2) _____

(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: May 12, 2010 Proposed Time: 10:30 AM(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _____	<u>1, 14</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

Regarding claims 1 and 14, 1) the claimed ring member is directly disposed on the susceptor, and however, the cited reference Ma (US 6,554,954) discloses ring members 50, 52 and 58, all of which are not disposed on the susceptor 22. Accordingly, the Ma's ring member 50, 52 and 58 does not corresponds to the claimed ring member.

Further, claims 1 and 14 recites 2) that an innermost circumference of the ring member surrounds a periphery of the substrate to be processed with a gap between the innermost circumference of the ring member and the periphery of the substrate to be processed, 3) and that a part of an upper surface of the lower ring body is disposed directly below the gap. In this regard, the Examiner opines that the apparatus of Ma is structurally capable of using a smaller substrate such that gap will be as recited. However, although the Ma's substrate is smaller, the gap capable of being formed is merely a gap between an innermost circumference of the ring member and a periphery of an electrostatic chuck, **not the claimed gap between the innermost circumference of the ring member and the periphery of the substrate to be processed**. Accordingly, the claimed gap does not be formed in Ma, and further, Ma is silent on the above feature 3).

Furthermore, claims 1 and 14 recites 4) that the claimed third surface being disposed outside the claimed first surface and inside the claimed second surface, 5) and that a height of an upper surface of the electrostatic chuck is substantially equal to a height of the claimed second surface, and a height of the upper surface of the lower ring body is lower than the height of the claimed second surface. However, Ma is completely silent on the claimed second surface (on which the ring member is directly mounted in the susceptor). In this regard, the Office Action indicated that Ma's portions 36, 44 and 48 if integrated with the susceptor would meet the height limitation. However, although the portions are integrated with the susceptor, a height of a Ma's portion corresponding to the claimed second surface never be substantially equal to a height of the electrostatic chuck 26, and thus, Ma does not achieve the technical effect of the present invention that a uniform sheath voltage is formed above the semiconductor wafer W and the focus ring 6, while etching the semiconductor wafer w by the plasma such that a uniform plasma etching processing can be conducted on the entire surface of the semiconductor W, thereby improving an in-surface uniformity of the plasma etching processing compared to conventional cases (see page 22, lines 2-5 of the specification).

Further, Tong (US 2004/0083975) and Hubacek (US 6,475,336) are also completely silent on the claimed features 1) to 5).